BALLARD SPAHR LLP

DMWEST #10475161 v2

NOTICE OF REMOVAL (Formerly Case No. A-13-692261-C in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada) CLERK OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that defendant TitleMax of Nevada, Inc. ("TitleMax") hereby removes this action originally filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court of On November 26, 2013, plaintiff Judith Starks ("plaintiff") initiated Case No. A-13-692261-C, Starks v. TitleMax of Nevada, Inc., in the Eighth Judicial

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2.	Through the Complaint,	plaintiff seeks	damages	and	equitable	relief	in
rolation to a	n automobile title lean						

- A Summons and Complaint were served upon TitleMax on December 5, 3. 2013. Accordingly, the last day for TitleMax to remove this action to federal court is January 6, 2014. See 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C). All documents previously filed with the Eighth Judicial District Court are attached as Exhibits A through G, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a). The Complaint and Summons are attached as Exhibits A and E, respectively.
- This is a civil action over which this Court has jurisdiction because there is diversity of citizenship between plaintiff and TitleMax and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
  - Plaintiff is a citizen of Nevada. (See Ex. A, Complaint at ¶ 2.) 5.
- 6. TitleMax is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Georgia.
- 7. Accordingly, there is diversity of citizenship between plaintiff and TitleMax.
- Where it is unclear or ambiguous from the face of a state-court 8. complaint whether the requisite amount in controversy is pled, a district court applies a preponderance of the evidence standard. Guglielmino v. McKee Foods Corp., 506 F.3d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 2007). Under this standard, the removing defendant must provide evidence establishing that it is more likely than not that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Id.
- 9. The principal amount of the loan in this case is \$6,000. (See Ex. A, Complaint at  $\P$  7.)
- 10. In addition, plaintiff seeks to recover the automobile securing the loan, which is valued at "over \$32,000." (See id.); see also Cohn v. Petsmart, Inc., 281 F.3d 837, 840 (9th Cir. 2002) ("In actions seeking declaratory or injunctive relief, it is well established that the amount in controversy is measured by the value of the object of

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106 702) 471-7000 FAX (702) the litigation.").

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Plaintiff also seeks "[c]onsequential damages in an amount to be 11. determined at trial, including but not limited to loss of use...." (See Ex. A, Complaint at ¶ 9.)
- 12. Plaintiff also seeks to recover attorney's fees against TitleMax. (See id. at ¶ 10); see also Galt G/S v. JSS Scandinavia, 142 F.3d 1150, 1156 (9th Cir. 1998) ("Where an underlying statute authorizes an award of attorneys' fees, either with mandatory or discretionary language, such fees may be included in the amount in controversy.").
- 13. Finally, plaintiff also requests punitive damages. (See Ex. A, Complaint Under Nevada law, a plaintiff who recovers less than \$100,000 in at ¶ 10.) compensatory damages may recover up to \$300,000 in punitive damages. See NRS 42.005(1)(b); see also Anthony v. Security Pac. Fin. Servs., 75 F.3d 311, 315 (7th Cir. 1996) ("Where punitive damages are required to satisfy the jurisdictional requirement in a diversity case, a two-part inquiry is necessary. The first question is whether punitive damages are recoverable as a matter of state law. If the answer is yes, the court has subject matter jurisdiction unless it is clear beyond a legal certainty that the plaintiff would under no circumstances be entitled to recover the jurisdictional amount."). Here, plaintiff's punitive damages could potentially range up to \$300,000.
- 14. Accordingly, the amount in controversy in this case is in excess of \$338,000, which exceeds \$75,000.
- A true and correct copy of this Notice of Removal is being filed this date with the Clerk of the Eighth Judicial District Court.

Dated: January 3, 2014.

26

27

28

## 

	1		BALLARD SPAHR LLP				
	2	2	/s/ Ann Marie Hansen Maren Parry Nevada Bar No. 9643				
	Ę	3	Nevada Bar No. 9643 Ann Marie Hansen				
	4	<u> </u>	Nevada Bar No. 10144 Matthew D. Lamb				
	5	5	Nevada Bar No. 12991				
	6	3	100 North City Parkway, Suite 1750 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106-4617 Telephone: 702.471.7000 Facsimile: 702.471.7070				
	7	7	Facsimile: 702.471.7070				
	8	3	Attorneys for TitleMax of Nevada, Inc.				
	ξ						
	10						
	11						
PE 1750	12						
R LLP	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106 (702) 471-7000 FAX (702) 471-7000	3					
BALLARD SPAHR LLP 100 NORTH CITY PARKWAY, SUITE 1750	NEVAD AX (702)	L					
	EGAS, 1-7000 F	5					
	LAS U						
1001	17	7					
	18						
	19						
	20						
	21						
	22						
	28						
	24						
	25						
	26						
	27						
	28	3					

(405) 144 (407) 144 (407) 145 (407) 146 (407)

100 NORTH CITY PARKWAY, SUITE 1750

BALLARD SPAHR LLP

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on January 3, 2014, a true copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF REMOVAL was filed via the Court's CM/ECF System and electronically served by the Court on all parties in interest.

/s/ Sarah Walton

An Employee of Ballard Spahr LLP